M 1830

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Group I

The Barn

MR. NYLAND: On Tuesday evening we usually discuss the Monday evening meeting. And usually Tuesday during the day I listen to it. It is sometimes quite lengthy, and together with the after-meeting. And I want to really know not only what is being said, but also how it is said. So I play it and I play it back every once in a while, and then I think, and so, together with a few other things during the day, the whole day goes by. I think it's very much worthwhile to listen to it, because for me it is like a thermometer, partly indicating progress of Work. Because I have to judge, to a very great extent, what happens in places where I am not and where, when Work is discussed, it is discussed on the basis of previous meetings or perhaps some tapes. But in any event, I'm not there on the spot to try to set certain things straight when I believe it is

necessary. So these little discussions on a Tuesday evening are like afterthoughts.

I listened the same way to Peter's meeting and also to Trudie's, and of course some of the meetings in other cities. But I'm very glad that I've asked the different people to take care of that so that when they need an answer it is not dependent entirely on me, bacause I cannot promise that I will be on time. So in order to make that part of an organization flow, I start to count a great deal on those who answer such tapes; and I count a great deal on these three groups - and I would say in particular the nucleus, because there we have an advantage of a nucleus.

You know, what is really the nucleus of seven? What's the meaning of it? It is now seven - I hope very soon a little bit more active. And it's quite right, because the seven belong together. One of them is a little different, and we call him 'moderator'. You know, a moderator has a task. And it is probably quite different from what you would expect. The six which are left over are like the six days of a week. And the seventh is like a Sunday. The six days of the week are work-days. The six members who are not moderating do the work. The moderator sits and, I would amost say, sits and contemplates and to keep things simply in order, because that is the idea of moderating. But he doesn't speak, practically. He sits there, and it is his time to be quiet. And it would give him an excellent opportunity to listen to what the others say, without having to enter into any kind of a discussion or even to feel that he should answer. It is his time to be quiet, because such things do happen in a nucleus that a person feels that, for that evening, he really would not like to speak. He feels that it is better sometimes that he just

listens and see what the others do so that he could profit by it. So that is really what I feel a moderator does, as it were, on a Sunday. He contemplates the work of the six other people, like on a Sunday, like on the seventh day of Creation, one looks at that what is taking place -- has taken place and has been created, and then one hopes one sees that it is good.

In the after-meetings, the moderator must give his opinion, quite impartially, about the activities of the other six. He does not enter into an argument. He enters, simply, in general conversation of giving his impressions of the meeting as it was. You see, a moderator is very much like a vice-president in Congress. He doesn't cast a vote; that's left to the members of Congress or the Senators. But when it is a tie, he can make a decisive vote. He does that in the after-meeting. He gives his honest impression of what it was like. And again, without argument, because he does not know why the different people who have answered, answered in the way they did. In that way there is a chance that, particularly in the after-meeting, not everybody is talking at the same time. You have to be much more quiet in that after-meeting. Sometimes, for those who are interested in these kind of meetings, it may be very much worthwhile to listen to some of them. And I would suggest, even, that you listen, if you have the time and the desire for it, of some -- Can you sit quiet? If it is not convenient, sit against the wall, because I noticed last time you were a little nervous. -- and it might be useful to listen to some of the meetings from other cities. But you see now, the purpose is much clearer, I hope.

Those who answer the questions have reason for answering it in the way they did. When there is a discussion of that, give each person a

chance after the moderator has given his idea. For the rest, the moderator does not enter, that evening, in the discussion. And I know what I'm saying, because it's very difficult. One feels every once in a while, as a moderator, that you have to extract a little bit from a questioner, and as it were, to pave the road. But it is not necessary. When it is asked who will answer, it is left to the other six, and then whoever wants to take the responsibility will build up his own method of inquiry. Now, it can be useful at an after-meeting that it is discussed, the kind of a person who was answered in a certain way. And then everybody can profit by what has been known, maybe, to one or two only.

There is another thing you have to remember quite well. The meeting is a meeting to give ideas about Work for those who want to know. The questions are asked in the meeting. After the meeting is over, there is no further discussion between the answerers and some of the members. It has become a habit. I don't like the habit at all. It should be avoided, that even if some of the members of the group would like to have a little tête-à-tête, you should refuse it. And you go immediately, practically, over into the after-meeting. You see, in that way, if you don't adhere to that, you create dissent. You separate from each other, because it looks as if someone in the meeting would like to have a special kind of advice from someone; and it is against the wish on the part of all six - and including the moderator, at other times another six - to be united and have a united front and to let things go then during the meeting and afterwards they can discuss it.

When like last night it happened that someone could not stand it very well because he was in a certain state where he needed an answer and did not really get a satisfactory answer, and then when he wanted to leave,

each person of the group has a right to say, "You can go." It's not up to the moderator; it is not the moderator's group. It is a group of the nucleus. But the question that is attached to that - it was not mentioned at the after-meeting - is, "How did it happen that such a person could not be kept there?" One should start to question: What was wrong that we could not, at that time, give a satisfactory answer and hold such a person? Why was it, and what mistake was made, and why aren't we able to do that? I would like to illustrate it, because these kind of experiences of course happen with many groups and with many people. And it has happened over the last years, as long as I have had meetings, there has been an inflow and an outflow - a passing through, as it were. Sometimes for a little short time, sometimes longer, and for various reasons. And I have a list of such people. And I every once in a while make inquiry. And every once in a while I would want to know why such a person did leave, in order to find out what I did not do right. And maybe it was impossible for me to do it; at the same time I have to know. If I do know, then I can profit, because then maybe next time I will know better, and I will be able, let's say it in a certain way: to be more flexible, to be more understanding.

This is what one should get out of any meeting. And one should get it, particularly out of a Monday and with a nucleus, with a discussion among yourselves. I call it flexibility . It is the adaptation to that what is the question, and to listen to the question quite clearly, and allow enough time to let such a question penetrate. And don't be in a hurry to answer. And perhaps there may be an indication that one of the nucleus would like to answer, but needs a little time. How a moderator will know that - that is the sensitivity of the moderator. One must see

to it that one is not too quick. And then it will be much better that such a person really can take -- take the question, perhaps explain to the questioner, what was the question - or make inquiry about why and then continue by building up, linking it up with the thoughts of the questioner, and building up something of a perspective after he has given the proof - I've told this before - that a questioner can trust the person who answers.

This is what one should learn in a group like that. One does not learn it overnight. It is a rather long process. It does not only require flexibility, it does require facility of the mind, and the flexibility in the way one attaches to the question and not in one's ordinary way, and surely not in such a way that one starts to criticize a questioner. You see, they come wanting to Work. But when they have been there only two weeks, what can you expect? And it is wrong to ask, "Do you think that is Work?" because they don't know what Work is. That's why they come. And it has to be told, what is Work, very simply, because that's what they come for. It is all right to link it up with what they are saying, but then it's quite definitely necessary to say, once in a while, "It is really not in the direction we would want to go if we want to grow up."

But don't expect a person to know why they really come, because the motivations for one's Work come very slowly. Seldom that a person immediately knows, "This Work is for me." It takes a long time to go from the curiosity and interest stage into the realization of the necessity that Work is really for oneself. And many times it is still considered Work for someone else. And it is coming usually through someone so that they go upon the person's word who tells them and then they come,

and you cannot expect them even to have a motivation than only there is an interest. And don't expect them to be able to tell you the difference between Work or not Work; or even that they think that they can explain Work already as something that belongs to them. It may take a very long time. And don't forget, this is so-called Group III ; that is, new people.

How were we when we met Work? And was there someone who kind of - in a strange kind of a voice, as a school-master - starts to question? Because if I were -- if I had asked such a question, I would never appear again. So many times these questions, when they have to be answered, the question is asked in a certain timid way, because it is as if one wants to talk about certain things more or less private, surely not for the gallery, and sometimes it's quite difficult to find the right kind of a word for them. And such allowances must be made constantly all throughout the meeting, and all the time, each answer must end with a statement of Work. Simply, if you like; emotionally, if you want to define it that way.

There was a question about presence to oneself. When that question comes up, and it is at the after-meeting, it must be settled, so that from then on each person can use the same language. If it is so-called 'A-B-C', which we use once in a while, it has to be exact, because there is an exact meaning to each one of such words - or such letters, A or B or C. And it was very strange that not enough was said about the word simultaneity . There is only one explanation for that. And although at the after-meeting it was discussed, during the meeting itself it was used so completely wrong, that it was really too bad that it was left like that, because other people listening to it will have an entirely different

opinion and then go off sometimes on the side-road. And it should have been corrected, even in the meeting - regardless. This would be a case where one could contradict an explanation in the presence of the members of a group, because this is a fundamental principle. And it is unfortunate that such a thing could not have been foreseen. And it's quite definitely necessary and it emphasizes, more and more, that particular requirement that the members of the nucleus know exactly what they understand by certain words in such strict definitions that one is not going to deviate from it; and that whenever the explanation is given, it is given in such words, or it is given in words which have that kind of a meaning.

It is, of course, so obvious what simultaneity means. But one has to have an idea of the structure of a relationship of 'I' and the qualities of 'I', and that what we endow an 'I' with in order to function. Of course, I've said Impartiality is a fundamental word. It's fundamental because it leads to the possibility of the creation of a Kesdjanian body, or the fulfillment of a feeling body into its completion. That is why it is important for a man on Earth. But when one talks about Work as a whole, and then wants to discuss not only Kesdjan but also the possibility of Soul, which of course is, as a description, inherent in the aim of Work, one has to do something about the influence of an intellect as it is now in this particular problem of the creation of something that is objective as a faculty within the brain. Also that was not explained correctly towards the end. And also the question of 'I' dividing and furnishing within one's emotional center the possibility of an objective 'something' which then functions in the same way as the 'I' intellectually would function for the brain - also that has to be understood. It was not clear.

But moreover, simultaneity does mean that in that process of the realization of a moment, I exclude associative values of the brain. Every form of thought has to be eliminated, because by definition that is the idea of an Objectivity: that one only can have an 'I' objective when it is not interfered with by the thoughts of a person; the same way as it cannot be functioning correctly when the impartiality is not there, which in that case would simply mean that the feelings interfere with the observation of a fact; and that kind of clarity of the bringing future and past into one point of the present in which that present is not noticed, as the past and the future is noticed by an ordinary brain unconsciously. But it's only at the point of the present there is the possibility of the elimination of all other kind of mental processes so that then what remains in existence is the possibility actually of that what could function in an objective sense.

Well, it can be straightened out, and I hope the nucleus will straighten it out. I have suggested, every once in a while, that if necessary you should write down what is the definition of a word. I have explained a few times, that at the time of Orage we walked around with a list of names, certain terminology, and we would have that in our pocket, and sit every once in a while, take it out when we had a cup of coffee by oneself, and start to think about it. We called it 'the ponder list'. And it was a very interesting list, because whenever you would look at that list, something would remind you and you would try to define what is really meant by such and such a term, based upon what we at that time knew, and which came via Orage and then from Gurdjieff and was not acquired by means of Ouspensky. But whichever way that is, we are living now in a little different kind of a condition. But the

principle remains the same. Whenever one wishes to talk about Work, it has to be exact. You know, I've used that word hundreds of times. And the reason why - it's only on the exactitude that you can build something. Everything that is not exact is wishy-washy. It will not last, and it will be destroyed.

One builds for the future by the realization of the present and the utilization of that what has gone on and is past. And that is why the word 'instantaneous' - at the moment - has to be understood as a good concept which eliminates ordinary thought processes. Then of course, I've explained that the moment as a duration, or a moment as expanding, or a moment which is like a point becoming dynamic, then expanding into space, will give then a concept of a duration, with a movement of this moment towards the outside world, and in its expansion, fill the Universe, that then the concept of the moment becomes absolute. But that, of course, you need not necessarily talk about that. But when you talk about simple 'A-B-C's, it has to be understood very, very clearly what is meant.

Still, I say that a meeting like last night was very useful. It may not be in every respect coming up to what I think is possible, and also what sometimes unfortunately is not done quite correctly. But many allowances must be made for that, because it is extremely difficult to remain exact, concrete, to the point, clear, logical, and because of that, persuasive. But you see, such problems, when they exist in a little group, they exist in exactly the same way with people in a larger group when they have dealings with each other. And it is such a pity that sometimes people do not feel at home. One can give every kind of food that is available. One can really do one's best and go out of one's way

in caring. And every once in a while, here and there, a certain idiosyncrasy creeps in; and someone experiencing it and being under that kind of an influence, may be too sensitive and then starts to think, "What am I doing here?" It is right that it happens; it is too bad when it has that kind of a result. I say it's right that it happens, because it is an ordinary mechanical feature - it cannot be avoided. But when it does happen, it could be avoided that it affects one to such an extent that one becomes upset, and even sometimes goes as far as saying, "It is not for me, I am ready to leave." That is a very serious problem, because one has a misunderstanding about what happens.

If one can understand that that what happens is a result of an ordinary mechanicality and an unconscious forms of behavior, if one actually knows that by experience, and there is a certain amount of knowledge within oneself which is not disturbed by anything that is still too superficial, and that one must not accredit too much than only saying, "It happens" - one can say, "Too bad." One is, you might say, bothered by a little ant that crawls on your leg, and you can brush it off. But you have to brush it off, and don't let it crawl further. And that is what happens so often. We keep on harping on that. And why do we? There is not enough strength to undo it. With an ant, it's easy because your hand is much stronger than the poor little ant. So, of course, you brush it away. But when there is very little strength within yourself, one gets hurt. And that then what affects you stays there. I wouldn't say that that what is hurting you is done intentionally. Since it is mechanical, I would say it cannot be helped. But what you can do is to help yourself not to be affected in such a way that your Essence is touched. What is necessary really for that? One can say one has a

certain sensitive nature. And that is quite right; and the more sensitive, the more chance of being hurt.

One can also say that one wishes to develop within oneself, to find something that you can call your own solidity, and that the property of that kind of solidity within yourself should be based on building blocks from your Essence. When it is really your inner life, there is no further inferiority complex, which is purely superficial. But when there is within oneself a realization, "This I am, and it doesn't matter what other people think or whatever they do to me - they will not touch me, because they cannot, they don't have that strength," and I then can protect myself. But what is usually in the way, and what is the reason that one is hurt? In the first place, it is that one, also for oneself, lives in a mechanical way. And by that I mean that I expect something from the outside world, so that whenever I react, I would like to have an explanation why I react. And that if I then consider the actions of others on me, my love for them or my hate for them comes out in me. And it becomes critical when they cannot agree, or hurt me, or I think different from what they think, or that I would have done differently from what they have done, and it is not a question anymore of understanding them or not, it is much too quick that I react.

And sometimes it's worse. I expect, from others, something that they cannot give. And only because I feel I need it, and not having enough within myself, I of course will look to the outside world for acclaim or for - not maybe respect, but something of: perhaps they like me; or that I want to be appreciated; or I want them to know that I am this and that and not just the tail of a donkey. And that I - I don't want to tell them that - that I am dependent on that what the audience is

for me, and that when they don't give it, I am hurt. And the hurt is only because I have nothing.

The more I can build for myself that what is building up treasures in Heaven, the less it is necessary to remain dependent. But one remains dependent for a long time, as the consequences of the organ Kundabuffer, even when the organ itself has been taken away. That what has caused the hurt, keeps on hurting, because I keep on remembering it. And when my mind is finally through with it, then maybe I can forget, unless something else again brings it to the foreground. And I go through the whole process again, of describing what actually happened to me at such and such a time, and such and such a person; and I again get hot under the collar as if it happens then, and it happened maybe many million years ago. This is a form of laziness. It is lethargic. It is the line of least resistance. And it is quite definitely a sign of mechanicality. But I cannot change the mechanicality of someone else outside, but I can change my own. And if I don't want to change my own, I do not wish to Work. I can claim sometimes that I want to, but when I continue to be hurt, I really do not get the results of Work. Because what is a result of Work which is far more important even than the understanding of 'A-B-C'? It is a peace of mind and a peace within my heart. It is the realization and also, without any doubt, the knowledge of the actuality of something existing within me which is more permanent, more pure and more real. This is how the change should take place when I Work. And if I don't feel this, that that gradually starts to function in me, I don't Work enough as yet, or I'm oversensitive or the conditions in which I happen to live are a little bit too much. What does one do in such a case? I cannot change my sensitivity very easily. And in particular, I cannot, when

exactly because of the results of Work, I become more sensitive.

I cannot always change the conditions, but to some extent, I can. And I can expose myself less and less to such influences which I know could hurt me. And in the third place, I could meet the conditions which hurt me, when I know it beforehand with an entirely different attitude; so that when it does happen, that they become an opportunity for me to Work on myself. That, of course, is the only way by which they can be permanently solved, because in doing this and the utilization of such things which are disturbing, I build an antitoxin against the disturbance. It is saying the same thing, that when I am hurt, I create within myself a substance to alleviate the hurt. And when the hurt is deep and it has affected my bloodstream, I create, by means of Work, a substitute for my bloodstream, and I call that 'Kesdjan'. And I then put the accent on something else within me, and as a result, that what used to hurt me will not hurt me any longer. It will be placed in a certain category. Sometimes it is still, for a little while, indicated by a sign - 'danger, don't approach too close' - and when I see that sign, I know that I'm clever enough to be able to avoid it many times. But there is always within oneself such a desire that I feel I can stand it and do it, and that I wish to become in my own eyes a hero, that I go a little too far, and I get burned before I know it, and then of course I have difficulty.

When it happens in a group, when people do not feel at home in a group, you have to consider really, quite definitely, who it is which causes that, or what conditions cause that kind of a state. One has to consider oneself - why one is, let's say, influenced - and to find out the cause of such influence, and also the reason why one is influenced

in that way within oneself. Don't run away from it. Face an issue. As I say, change conditions if it's a little difficult. But Work means fighting for your Life. It means trying to get along with people who were enemies. It means that there is something in you that should be developed within yourself, which is not there, in order to give you strength to take an enemy and to make use of him; to take all the different influences of this Barn and to include in it all the things which at first sight sometimes are a little obnoxious, and which you don't want and you shy away from them. And gradually, if you want to swim, you start to approach the edge of the water with your toes and you try to see, can you actually walk a little bit, even if it's a little bit too cold for the darling little toes of you. If one has a desire to swim - and that of course has to be paramount - if one wants to extract the last farthing from this Barn, you have to stick it out. And you have to utilize what there is. And in that kind of a process, with changing conditions over which you then start to have a certain command, you will create for yourself an entirely different way of being able to live.

Try to understand what is meant when the Bible talks about Christ going to Heaven to prepare a house for you. That what you wish to prepare, as a result of Work, is the possibility of living in a new house which you call 'Kesdjan'; and later, 'Soul'. -- All right. (Turning of cassette.) -- By that is meant that Christ represents Work on yourself. And that Work on yourself will prepare living quarters for that what is created as a result of Work and that what will grow up and will be looking for the possibility of being quartered within a certain body.

It's not a question to ask God for advice. It's a question which you have to settle for yourself as you grow up; from early youth, becoming

more and more interested in the real growth of yourself; and then the creation of such conditions which you believe might be conducive for that kind of a growth. And really not to give up - if you possibly can - not too soon. Because what will become of you, if you want to leave, and you have eaten halfway of something that started to become palatable and then someone has taken away your plate? But it is not someone else who takes it away. It is that you left the table. And the question always comes up: Do you have a right to leave a table? Is there something in one's experience that you can say, "Apparently I have to experience this, because it happens to come my way. I do not know the reasons, but I know it is there and it must be sent for a certain purpose." It is the totality of one's Life one looks at that way. You don't know why you were born on Earth, and that you also -- you don't know that you happen to be here, you don't know why you heard about Gurdjieff - those are things that you can say 'just happened'. But it is definite that when you once accept such facts, you have to have an attitude towards it.

The first thing that you accept is the fact of your Life, having been born on Earth. The second fact is that you happen to be at the Barn in community with a few people, and you have to see: What is there in it for me? What can I extract from it? Because for some reason or other, I am here. It doesn't mean that you cannot leave, because you're entirely free to go. And what I'm saying simply means for those who are--have a little more stick-to-it-iveness and where the sensitivity can be temporarily overbridged or put in the background and say, "Don't bother me now, because I have to do something." And the third is that definitely you want to extract something for your own - for yourself; to be able to say, "I have fought for this, because I wanted to know the reason why I happen

to be born on Earth, and why I happen to meet such and such conditions and why it happened that I discovered my Karma in such conditions."

You see, the experiences that one will have as a result of these kind of thoughts, closely linked up with the desire that one wants to Work on oneself - and interpreting then what is given, as a method, in the best way one can, and basing it on a sincerity, and quite honestly wanting to try - what is there sometimes in the way? Exactly these kind of thoughts. They enter and prevent you, every once in a while to see clear of what is needed - and the Objectivity sometimes cannot be there because the subjective thoughts and feelings keep on crowding in and out. They are not enemies at that time, because they have nothing to do with the thoughts of Work. They just happen to be in the way. They become enemies when they start to tell you that the thought is just as good a substitute as the idea of Awareness. Then it is an enemy. A thought is an enemy when it keeps on giving arguments why things cannot be done. A thought becomes an enemy when it introduces constantly rationalization processes which are based on associations. A thought is an enemy when one blames one's nature for the condition in which one is and 'therefore nothing can be done about it'. And including in this kind of an accusation of nature, one also takes one's father and mother, and the condition in which one happened to be born and early youth and all the rest of which the mind is quite capable to bring to the foreground any time that you have any kind of a possibility of postponing Work, that there is a very good reason why, at that time, you cannot Work anyhow.

But you see, when there are thoughts and feelings which come within a person when he is interested, let's say for a moment, (in) esoteric ideas , or the Life Hereafter , or trying to understand concepts of

inner life, and that one knows with one's inner life that certain things have taken place already, and that one has become partly, maybe, even religious, partly sensitive or artistic, partly wishing intellectually to lift up the veil of the Temple, that then such people, they are bothered by their own thoughts and feelings, because that was familiar ground, and then when something else happens which is then at that time associated in some way or other with Work, one of course thinks about - it is an interpretation - 'this is a result.' And I've said so many times, there must not be an argument. It has to be accepted without saying 'it is' or 'it isn't'. But one must encourage a person: Go on - you will find, gradually - but always remember, Work is not your old thoughts and not your old experiences. And it has really nothing to do with what you already know, because the idea and the principle of Work, in an Objective sense explained, belongs to an entirely different kind of a world, where you have never set your foot. And you don't know even, when you would get there, how to behave. So you cannot describe that kind of an experience, because you have not as yet experienced it. But continue and continue and rely that when you will not forget, Work is something I must try to find out what it means, that one must give less and less attention to the old forms of experiences which, as I say, remain in the way as long as you keep on hanging onto them. Let them go. They were beautiful at the time.

And a new experience, even if it is interpreted in a certain way, one is not quite sure. But why do you want to be sure? Of what? What good does it do? It still leaves the question: Do I Work in the way I understand Work now, and not the way my grandfather would have told it to me when I was a little boy hanging over his knee and falling half

asleep and when he would tell me a story? That's all so beautiful. But that is not what we mean when we say we have to make something, out of this world, for the possibility of further growth of oneself. It's an entirely different set of concepts. One doesn't think about them usually in ordinary life. And the more one starts to read esoteric books without any further application, or without any indication that they ought to be applied, where it is still a little bit of lovely intellectual gymnastics, where it is very interesting for the mind to have a table of Hydrogen, without having to do anything with it, not even understanding what are meant by 'forty-eight' or 'ninety-six' or whatever it is that are numbers, numbers, numbers, one after the other.

We have two numbers. One is seven, and the other is three. That's what we are interested in. And we're interested primarily, in the beginning - in our unconscious state - in seven, the Law of Seven - an octave , we say. Sometimes we expand that, because it does not apply all the time. We say there are really two other points also that I must consider, and then the total value of the Law of Seven would be a Law of Nine. But I hesitate a little bit about that because I'm not quite sure how seven and nine are related, than only I can make it out of seven - I can make nine - I can put two to it, of course; I can divide it up into two sets of three and one, and then I can see the three. I add another three. And then I get ten. And all kind of things I can do with it if I want to. But I'm interested in ordinary phenomena of life. And I find that the Law of Seven gives a little indication of what is taking place.

And then when I want to lift the veil, as I say, of the Temple - and the story is that when I do, I will die - my intellect sometimes forces me to do such things; that is, I sometimes am forced, by my

intellect, to continue to live in conditions which I know are deleterious, and I cannot stand because I'm too sensitive. And if I continue with that, I die to that group, and I must leave. Of course this can happen. But it is only because you stared yourself blind on the law of phenomena only, because in each person you could see the Law of Seven and a representation of the Law of Seven in all the events of the world as we know it, because the Law of Seven belongs to the Earth. And it is on that basis that we start to describe ourselves. And without going into an inner existence, I will not discover the Law of Three out of the Law of Seven, until I do something.

The analysis of the Law of Seven - that is, the consideration of what takes place on Earth when I start to analyze how is seven made up, I see two triads: DO-RE-MI and SOL-LA-SI, connected with what - something; according to the octave, a kind of a large bridge of one and a half notes. But it gives me already a concept. There is a three somewhere. Then I look at the totality of my life. I say 'DO'; 'FA' - which I know is a difficult point; 'SI-DO'. Again, three. I discover a law behind the Law of Seven. I start to realize that that what is the Law of Seven as described on an Enneagram is there, but in order to give it balance, and not touching, in the Law of Seven - which is only 1-4-2-8-5-7, never six, never three, never nine - I say, "There is something suspicious about not having a three. Why a one and a two, and why then skip to four? And five - and no six - I go to seven and eight. I go back again to one, I never reach nine." Then I say, "That Enneagram has to have a double meaning." And when I become familiar with it, I see that a triangle balances the Law of Seven. And then I become familiar with three, with six, with nine. And I say, "Strange. Three times three is nine." Then

measure is different.

Then I start to see that in the old laws of nature, the old laws of the past, the old laws of all my experiences unconsciously, I never discovered really, where is the three, than only when I have been thinking about my youth; when, in the time when I started to grow up and became a little bit responsible, such questions did come to one's mind; and that every once in a while a poem is written from that period. And sometimes a little bit of an essay or a statement, not understanding it, perhaps even repetitious from something that one hears about God the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost , or sometimes thinking 'father, mother, child', sometimes considering positive and negative and almost smelling the possibility of a neutrality between, because I know there is a neutrality when I go from the positive to the negative. When I'm a little scientific I say, "Where is the zero?" It is accepted at a certain point. And one says that point certainly is the melting point of ice. And then I go over from a liquid into the solidity. But it is not as yet zero. And there is no universal scale of temperature until I come to absolute zero, 273 below. And then I know that from there on, everything becomes positive.

You see, when that happens and one thinks about these ideas - because when one is young, one is also very sensitive - and every once in a while, recalling them, and taking them, and reading, and then reminiscing, it is a very good antidote to offset the present conditions of being hurt too much. At such a time one was not hurt. At such a time one was happy, but within oneself. At such a time one could feel the Law of Three. One knew the Law of Seven with one's mind. The Law of Three became a quantity within one's heart, and a quantity of a tremendously high quality. You

see, the two points on Earth, between a line - when that what then for further measurement becomes another kind of an axis, Y, X and Z - indicated the Law of Three. A cube. When one talks about dimensions, there is a three, and then there is a solid. And it remains solid even if there are four or five or as many angles and corners as you may wish. But the three always remains fundamental.

But I don't want to talk too much about that, because I started to talk about sensitivity in a group and the necessity of having perseverence, that you really want to know what is it you wish to find for yourself. And I'm not talking now to people who just arrived and are in Work just a little bit, because they cannot understand that. They are not deep enough, not even immersed enough in Work. They are still hanging onto the skirts of Mother Nature and they want to interpret everything in accordance with what they already know. And they hate to admit that there is something that perhaps they don't know as yet. And whenever you dish up a new concept of Objectivity, they will look at that kind of a dish and they will say, "What does it taste like?" And when you say, "Nothing like that you have ever tasted," they will start to eat and then say, "It tastes a little bit too salty." Or, "It is really like - cinnamon. No, no, maybe not that. It is something else." They end up by describing it as a mixture of all kind of things they are familiar with. And then the final crown is placed on it by saying, "It is that, and that is the Word." And with that in their pocket they go home and they lose any further interest in Work. Try to prevent it.

When you talk about Work, you always have to give a little bit extra together with giving them an idea of the meaning or a description of that what is for them intellectually understandable, more comprehensible pro-

bably than would be possible for their heart or their emotional states. Always there has to be something additional. It is not just a description of that what one can achieve. It is to try to hold out for them some kind of a concept which becomes desirable when you wish to describe it, not in the ordinary modern way of a house which is built up and it has no leaks and it is perfect as far as the heat is concerned and it is so lovely - but you don't feel at home. It is a description, you know; sometimes I remember: "How did Heaven look? What is it like?" You see, the descriptions I remember - a Christian and a Jewish person were discussing; and the Christian was telling about the Heaven of the Jews. "Oh," he said, "it was lovely - but such people and such a noise - and this and that and everything - but it was not bad, but - - such a noise! So many." And then the Jew told him, he said, "I had a dream. It was a Christian and it was so beautiful. It was like Paradise. Heaven. Everywhere. Marvelous this and that - and really, I stood aghast," he said, "but nobody was in it." You see, I remember these kind of things.

It is far better that there is somebody living in a house. To make a house occupied, something has to live in an intellectual description; and it has to be your feeling, so that something then starts to become alive in one. And that that what is given as the possibility of an oasis is the actuality of being able to drink water, so that then one can continue on a certain road, even if one is sensitive and even if it is difficult, because something at the end is pictured, in beautiful terminology sometimes, but words used which are convincing. Sometimes very quietly said so that one feels the vibration of the truth in them. So that at such a time a person is not listening really to what you're saying, but he wants to know, because the way you say it tells him that

something is there and it is worthwhile, because you have conveyed the idea that that what was Work for you was your Life and it belonged to that sincerity so that at any one time he can find out, as if going to a dictionary, what kind of a word has to be used, but he has had a feeling of a sentence. He understood with his mind a little prose, but he understood with his heart what is poetry.

And these are the kind of things that one has to keep in mind when you want to talk about Work to others: How can you make it attractive, sufficiently convincing, so that the other will say, "You must be right, I will try," because then they are willing to give up something of their old life. And then they will start as you have indicated to make attempts. And then you can rely on such attempts to give them the truth for themselves. And then they themselves will eliminate old stuff that they know has not been sufficient because they were looking in search for the miraculous, and they would not come to a Gurdjieffian group unless they believed that there is something miraculous that they would wish. You must not kill that desire. You must make sure that always there is a possibility that the miracle is around the corner, but that one has to Work for it, and no one knows when it might come. Always this end, this purpose of the Unity of God, understanding the Law of Three out of this what is now simply mechanical Law of Seven. But the hope has to be given that in that kind of simplicity of going from seven to three that something is added that's fundamental truth, which is not in the law of phenomenon but which is behind the phenomenon, and then becomes apparent when the veil of the phenomena is lifted and the interior of the Temple becomes seen.

With an 'I', one forgets one's ordinary eyes and the sense organs.

One has to have s substitute. But that 'I' is not functioning like we call observation in ordinary life. It is functioning like something present to one, of which one becomes aware, not being able to touch or even to define it, but the things unseen, which is the faith, so that one knows once and for all that that is the truth and no further description or argument is needed. This has to come out whenever one talks about Work. I call that simply 'conviction' in a very simple way, emphasizing the word; but almost I would say, softly, "Why? Because it is necessary to make them listen." One has to know when to change that voice into such a whisper that they will come forward and say, "What? What did you say?" because they don't want to miss that. All such things are, in this kind of Work, for oneself.

Work is (palladium); that is, panacea, a medicine for all ills. That is the way one must look at the possibility of application. That is why the opportunity for a Barn with many people that come together, and some a little clearer about their aim than others, and some still dumb, we know that - but who will lose his dumbness so soon when it is made up for many years without having done anything about it? Who can expect a person to be able to change his aspiration into inspiration overnight, when you already start to doubt if they ever know what aspiration means: the willingness to give up something in order to reach something higher. How many people are willing to stand on their psychological toes to reach a higher shelf? These are the problems, of course, all of us will face in time, and gradually it will become clearer and clearer of what is really needed, because the perseverance will help you. After some time it will not be that strict, because you will start to live already. It is like swimming. You have to apply first. After some time, you can do

the double stroke without even thinking about it.

When there is a melody in your heart and you try to play it, you don't need techinque. You need a heart. You need something like a piano or violin, or whatever you play, to give it tone. And you can establish a rhythm and you can connect it, it's a melody all your own. It's the melody of your life that you want to play. And only gradually, you see, when you make a few mistakes, and you say, "But that index should have come before the third finger and it isn't there at the proper place because my hand was not flexible enough and I didn't use my thumb at the right time." I learn technique because I have a melody. When I want to express something, it doesn't matter so much that I cannot as yet express it, but it is there in embryo, and it can come out when I then need technique. Of course I will Work, because I know that because of that it will be able for me to express what I want. And I will end up with my hands flying over the keys, and reaching the right notes in space, because I have a sense of space. I know where my hands are, I know where the keys are and the keyboard. I know exactly what has to be struck, even if I don't look at my left hand, because my melody is the right hand, if it is there; it's an indication of what belongs. And as a result of living in the melody of my heart, my fingers become my servants.

When Work starts to grow within one, that what is the phenomenal law is a servant for oneself. All the different experiences of ordinary life, all the knowledge you have of the things you have studied, all the different things that you call 'education' will find the proper place. The usage of your body, for whatever purpose it may have been designed, you will know when there is a development of your intellect and a development of your emotional state. But that comes first. And then the other things, like

the understanding of the law of phenomenon, will be added to the Enneagram to give you a chance to see how to go around the circumference; how it is possible at times to go from one to four and cross the triangle twice; how, at the first crossing, one is interested in that what one can take, because the first crossing is going from nine to three. And that the second crossing is from three to six, in which then, when I return, I take from that what I have received from the other and I give it back to the circle so as to be free when I reach the point two, next to one.

Try to see the Enneagram. Try to visualize what takes place when the Law of Seven crosses the Law of Three. This is what I mean: When ordinary law and life is crossed by that what is spiritual existence and inner life, when that what is Objectivity starts to become interested in the conditions of the Earth and in the subjectivity, in crossing and uniting participates in that what is unconsciously to be done, that then the help from the objective possibility will enable a man to become free from the debts of Mother Nature a little sooner, without disturbing her and without being hurt by having to give up what one already long ago was willing to give up, but could not.

It is like in Hamlet, when he says, "I take," someone - Antonio, I think - said, "I take my farewell from you, sir." And Hamlet says, "You cannot take anything from me that I'm not more willing to give." This is how Objectivity takes subjectivity from a man. When he is willing to give and say 'farewell' to his subjectivity, Mother Nature cannot take it from you, because you are ahead of the game; and you give it to her, because there is no further use. You live in a different world, and that is the striving towards a further understanding of the laws of the Universe.

These thoughts should, to some extent, go on a little piece of paper,

somewhere in your pocketbook. And you should take them out once in a while when things are quiet, and particularly now when the spring is here and you can afford to sit outside without too much of a coat, and that the wind can come and there are the birds already singing early in the morning; and the flowers which come gradually, also gingerly, not very -- very daring as yet, maybe still a little bit much cold, but they will come. They will come also maybe too soon.

The hope one must have within one's heart, the faith one must have within one's mind, the wish one must have within that what is Kesdjanian, the Will which must come from the direction of a Conscious mind - such a man has an aim, such a man will be able to cross all bridges. But cross first the bridge of your ordinary life. That what is within one's ordinary life is FA, which, when one crosses it, entitles one to a new lease on life in the form of air, but purified by something that one doesn't know as yet. But all polluted forms of unconsciousness have disappeared and in their place is a stream of purity.

Good night.

END TAPE

Transcribed: Andy Andrews
First Proof: Marjorie Corbett
Second Proof: Penny Jennings
Final Proof and Type: Lenore Beach